DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 423 308 TM 029 196

AUTHOR Carey, Nancy; Rowand, Cassandra; Farris, Elizabeth

TITLE State Survey on Racial and Ethnic Classifications. Statistical Analysis Report.

INSTITUTION Westat, Inc., Rockville, MD.

SPONS AGENCY National Center for Education Statistics (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO NCES-98-034
PUB DATE 1998-08-00
NOTE 69p.
PUB TYPE Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classification; *Ethnic Groups; *Federal Government; *Racial Differences; Standards; *State Programs; Surveys; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS *Office of Management and Budget

ABSTRACT

The State Survey on Racial and Ethnic Classifications was conducted for the National Center for Education Statistics and the Office for Civil Rights in the U.S. Department of Education as part of the research associated with the comprehensive review of an Office of Management and Budget (OMB) directive on race and ethnic standards for federal statistics and administrative reporting. The survey was conducted to provide information for OMB about the quality and utility of the data collected by state departments of education using the five standard federal categories of race and ethnicity in use at that time. The issues examined in this report include: (1) the use of classifications that differ from those five standard categories (White, nonHispanic; Black, nonHispanic; Hispanic; Asian or Pacific Islander; American Indian or Alaskan Native): (2) the impetus for making changes to classification categories; (3) the types and origins of complaints received about the categories; and (4) the effect of possible changes on the collection, maintenance, and reporting of trend data. The survey was conducted as a telephone interview with a representative in each state (except Hawaii) in February 1997. Eight states reported using categories other than the five standard categories. Five states reported using a "multiracial" category, while two use an "other," one uses "Filipino," and one separates American Indians and Alaskan Natives. Complaints from parents and school districts were the main reasons given by states for modifying or considering modifications to the federal categories. Adding a multiracial category was the most frequently requested change. Three states reported that they were considering making changes to the categories, but the remaining states and the District of Columbia had not made any changes and reported none under consideration. Appendixes contain a discussion of the survey methodology and copies of the survey protocols. (Contains 12 tables.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 423 308

National Center for Education Statistics

Statistical Analysis Report: August 1998

STATE SURVEY ON RACIAL AND ETHNIC CLASSIFICATIONS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TM029196

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FRSS
Fast Response Survey System

NCES 98-034

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

Statistical Analysis Report August 1998

State Survey on Racial and Ethnic Classifications

Nancy Carey
Cassandra Rowand
Elizabeth Farris
Westat, Inc.

Shelley Burns, Project Officer
National Center for Education Statistics

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement NCES 98-034

U.S. Department of Education
Richard W. Riley
Secretary

Office of Educational Research and Improvement
C. Kent McGuire
Assistant Secretary

National Center for Education Statistics
Pascal D. Forgione, Jr.
Commissioner

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is the primary federal entity for collecting, analyzing, and reporting data related to education in the United States and other nations. It fulfills a congressional mandate to collect, collate, analyze, and report full and complete statistics on the condition of education in the United States; conduct and publish reports and specialized analyses of the meaning and significance of such statistics; assist state and local education agencies in improving their statistical systems; and review and report on education activities in foreign countries.

NCES activities are designed to address high priority education data needs; provide consistent, reliable, complete, and accurate indicators of education status and trends; and report timely, useful, and high quality data to the U.S. Department of Education, the Congress, the states, other education policymakers, practitioners, data users, and the general public.

We strive to make our products available in a variety of formats and in language that is appropriate to a variety of audiences. You, as our customer, are the best judge of our success in communicating information effectively. If you have any comments or suggestions about this or any other NCES product or report, we would like to hear from you. Please direct your comments to:

National Center for Education Statistics
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
U.S. Department of Education
555 New Jersey Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20208–5574

August 1998

The NCES World Wide Web Home Page address is
http://nces.ed.gov

Suggested Citation
U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. *State Survey on Racial and Ethnic Classifications (Fast Response Survey System),* NCES 98-034, by Nancy Carey, Cassandra Rowand, and Elizabeth Farris. Project Officer, Shelley Burns. Washington, DC: 1998.

Contact:
Shelley Burns
(202) 219–1463

This report was prepared by Westat, Inc., under contract with the National Center for Education Statistics.

The State Survey on Racial and Ethnic Classifications was conducted for the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) in the U.S. Department of Education as part of the research associated with the comprehensive review of Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Statistical Policy Directive No. 15, "Race and Ethnic Standards for Federal Statistics and Administrative Reporting" (Executive Office of the President, 1977). This survey was conducted to inform the OMB about the quality and utility of the data collected by state departments of education using the five standard federal categories of race and ethnicity in use at that time. The issues examined in this report include the use of classifications that differ from those five standard categories (white, non-Hispanic; black, non-Hispanic; Hispanic; Asian or Pacific Islander; American Indian or Alaskan Native); the impetus for making changes to the classification categories; the types and origins of complaints received about the categories; and the effect of possible changes on the collection, maintenance, and reporting of trend data.

This survey was conducted as a structured telephone interview with representatives from state departments of education during February 1997. The interview followed different paths depending on the procedures for collecting data on race and ethnicity in that state's data collections. States were divided into three categories: those that had already made changes to the five standard federal categories, those that were considering changes, and those that had made no changes and were not considering changes in the near future. Interviews were completed with all states except Hawaii. Throughout this report, the District of Columbia is counted as a state.

Highlights

- Eight states reported using categories other than the five standard categories used by the federal government (table 1). In addition to the standard federal categories, five states reported using a "multiracial" category, two use an "other" category, one (California) uses "Filipino" as a separate category, and one (Alaska) breaks the American Indian or Alaskan Native category into two separate categories (table 2).

- Complaints from parents and school districts were the main reasons given by states for modifying or considering modifications to the standard federal categories (table 4).

- Three states reported that they were considering making changes to the standard federal categories for collecting information (table 1). The remaining 38 states and the District of Columbia have not made any changes and report none under consideration.

- Thirty-six states reported that the data they receive from school districts always conform either to the five standard federal categories or the modified state-approved categories (table 5).

- Of the 40 states that reported receiving comments or complaints about their current procedures, 24 had heard from both schools and parents. Of these 24 states, 16 reported that they had received more comments from one group than another—11 states had received more comments from parents, and 5 states had received more comments from schools (table 7).

- Adding a "multiracial" category was the most frequently requested change—31 states reported receiving such requests (table 8).

- With regard to revising forms, revising computer systems, and training employees, the expected impact reported by states that had already made some changes was generally less than the impact anticipated by states in which no changes had been made (table 9).

- With respect to the impact on maintaining and reporting trend data, 17 states indicated that changes to the data categories would affect their enrollment projections and/or prevent comparisons across time; 10 states indicated that the impact had been or would be nonexistant or minimal (table 11).

- Eighteen states maintained that there was no need to change the current federal system of classifying data on race and ethnicity. Another 20 states expressed the need either to add additional categories to reflect the nation's increased diversity (7 states) or to add a "multiracial" category to reflect the growing population of mixed-race individuals (13 states) (table 12).

- Of the 13 states that suggested adding a "multiracial" category, 2 had already made changes (table 12). Of the 7 states that suggested other new categories to reflect racial diversity, none had made changes; 2 were considering changes to the current system.

Table of Contents

	Page
Highlights	iii
Introduction	1
To What Extent Are States Using Categories Other Than the Five Standard Federal Categories?	4
What Prompted States to Make Changes to the Way Data on Race and Ethnicity Are Collected?	7
How Do States Handle Nonconforming Data Received from School Districts?	8
Complaints or Requests for Revisions of the Racial/Ethnic Categories from Parents and School Districts	10
Impact of Changes to the Standard Federal Categories on Data Collection Procedures	13
Time Required to Implement Changes to Data Collection	14
Impact on the Ability of States to Maintain and Report Trend Data	14
Perceived Need to Make Changes to the Current System	16
Summary and Conclusions	18

List of Appendices

Appendix

A	Survey Methodology	19
B	Telephone Protocols	25

List of Tables

Table

1 Percent minority enrollment in public elementary and secondary schools in 1995 and extent to which states have made revisions to the five standard federal categories when classifying data on the race and ethnicity of students, by state: 1997 5

2 Additional categories used by states to classify data on the race and ethnicity of students, by state: 1997 6

3 Procedures used by states using additional racial and ethnic categories to report data in the five standard federal categories to the federal government, by state: 1997 6

4 Reasons given for modifying the way racial and ethnic data on students are classified, by state: 1997 7

5 Procedures used by states for submitting data to the federal government when they receive data from school districts that do not conform to the five standard federal categories or the modified state-approved categories, by state: 1997 9

6 Number of states estimating the volume of complaints or requests for changes they have received in the past 5 years regarding the categories used to classify data on the race and ethnicity of students: 1997 10

7 Sources of the complaints or requests for changes received by states in the past 5 years regarding the categories used to classify data on the race and ethnicity of students, by state: 1997 11

8 Number of states that have received various requests for changes to the categories used to classify data on the race and ethnicity of students in the past 5 years: 1997 12

9 Number of states estimating the degree of impact that changes to the categories used to classify data on students' race and ethnicity have had, or would have, on various data collection procedures: 1997 13

10 Actual and estimated amount of time (in months) required to implement changes to the categories used to classify data on the race and ethnicity of students, by number of states: 1997 14

11 Impact of changes to the five standard categories on states' abilities to maintain and report trend data, by state: 1997 15

12 Extent to which states reported a perceived need to change their current procedures used to classify data on students' race and ethnicity, by state: 1997 17

Introduction

The federal government collects information on race and ethnicity for a variety of purposes, including monitoring job discrimination and school segregation. Federal agencies make use of the data they collect on race and ethnicity for planning, program monitoring, enforcement, and analyses. While the Census Bureau has included a question on race in each census since 1790, the content and format of the question and the method of data collection have changed over the years.

In 1974, the federal government created an Ad Hoc Committee on Racial and Ethnic Definitions. The committee was charged with developing specific terms and definitions for designating race and ethnicity so that a broad range of data could be collected by federal agencies on a comparable and nonduplicative basis. In 1977, the federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) issued "Race and Ethnic Standards for Federal Statistics and Administrative Reporting," which were contained in Statistical Policy Directive Number 15 (Executive Office of the President). For the first time, standard categories and definitions were to be used by all federal agencies in both collecting and presenting data on racial and ethnic populations. Directive 15 established four discrete categories for collecting data on race—American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander; black, and white—and categories for sorting ethnicity into "Hispanic origin," and "not of Hispanic origin." These categories may be combined into a simple list of five racial and ethnic classifications: American Indian or Alaskan Native; Asian or Pacific Islander; Black, not of Hispanic origin; Hispanic; and White, not of Hispanic origin. These categories were developed largely to produce data on population groups that historically have suffered discrimination and differential treatment in the United States because of their race or ethnicity (Evinger, 1995).

The standard federal categories for data on race and ethnicity have been used for more than 20 years. During that time, the country's population has become considerably more diverse, both racially and ethnically. In fact, during the 1980s, immigration to the United States reached historic levels, and since the 1965 Immigration Act, the flows have come primarily from Mexico, Central and South America, the Caribbean, and Asia rather than Europe and Canada (Harrison and Bennett, 1995). Also, while the proportion of interracial marriages is still relatively small (about 2 percent of all marriages in the United States), the numbers of such unions have been increasing and have resulted in a large increase in the population of individuals of mixed race or ethnicity (Evinger, 1995). These demographic changes raised concerns on the part of data collectors and respondents themselves that the standard federal categories adopted in 1977 no longer reflect the diversity of the nation's population.

In July 1993, OMB announced that it would undertake a comprehensive review of the current categories, including an analysis of the possible effects of suggested changes to the categories on the quality and utility of the resulting data. An integral and essential part of OMB's review has been research and testing conducted by a number of federal agencies on alternative approaches to collecting data on race and ethnicity. The review activities have included a series of four congressional hearings in 1993 on the measurement of race and ethnicity in the decennial census (U.S. House, 1994); a workshop in 1994, organized by the National Academy of Sciences and attended by representatives of federal agencies, academia, social science research, interest groups, private industry, and local school districts; an interagency committee chaired by OMB; research activities by the Census Bureau (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1996; 1997), the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the National Center for Health Statistics on individual identification of race and ethnicity; and research by the Department of Education on how information on race and ethnicity is collected in administrative record data (e.g., schools). This last aspect of the research effort began with a 1995 survey of public schools designed to provide information on the collection of racial and ethnic data by schools and to identify any problems they were experiencing in recording and reporting these data using the five standard federal categories (U.S. Department of Education, 1996). As revealed by the findings from the *School Survey on Racial and Ethnic Classifications*:

- Seventy-three percent of schools reported using only the five standard federal classifications.

- Although 41 percent of schools reported that there were students for whom the 5 standard federal categories are not accurate, most schools reported that less than 5 percent of their students were affected.

- Most respondents (69 percent) reported that adding a "multiracial category" was not an issue or was a minor issue in terms of applicability to students enrolled in their schools.

The survey described in this report is also part of this research agenda. The data collected from this survey were intended to provide OMB with information on the collection of racial and ethnic data from administrative records by state departments of education for their own and federal reporting purposes. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) in the Department of Education commissioned the study. Data on the following issues were collected from 49 states (Hawaii did not take part in the survey) and the District of Columbia. The results were shared with OMB and the interagency committee:

- The use of any classifications that differ from the five standard federal categories, and how these additional categories are reported to the federal government;

- The impetus within states for making changes to the five standard federal categories;

- Whether or not state departments of education have received complaints about the current system of data collection and the nature of these complaints; and

- The effect that changes in collecting race and ethnicity information have had, or that changes in state or federal laws would have, on the cost and time required to collect this information and on the maintenance and reporting of trend data.

In October 1997, OMB released new categories for collecting data on race and ethnicity (*Federal Register*, October 1997, 62FR58782-89). The data from this report were supplied to OMB during its decision making process. To designate race, the new categories are *White; Black or African American; Asian; Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander*; and *American Indian or Alaska Native*. To designate ethnicity, the categories are *Hispanic or Latino* and *Not Hispanic or Latino*. While OMB did not add a "multiracial" category, individuals are allowed to report one or more races when they self-identify. These new categories were used by the Census Bureau in the 2000 Census Dress Rehearsal conducted in spring 1998 and will be used in the 2000 Census. Other federal programs are encouraged to adopt the standards as soon as possible, but no later than January 1, 2003.

This report presents the findings from the *State Survey on Racial and Ethnic Classifications* conducted for NCES by Westat, Inc., a research firm in Rockville, Maryland. The survey was conducted through the NCES Fast Response Survey System (FRSS) during February 1997. FRSS is a survey system designed to collect small amounts of data with minimal burden placed on respondents and within a relatively short timeframe. Telephone interviews were to be conducted with representatives from the departments of education in all 50 states and the District of Columbia, but the representative from Hawaii was unavailable for interview. Throughout this report, therefore, information is presented on the 49 responding states and the District of Columbia. For reporting purposes, the District of Columbia is counted as a state in the tables and discussion of this report. Details of the survey methodology are presented in appendix A, and copies of the telephone protocols used for the interviews are included as appendix B.

To What Extent Are States Using Categories Other Than the Five Standard Federal Categories?

Eight states reported using any categories other than the five standard federal categories (table 1), and three states indicated that modifications to the five standard federal categories are being considered. The remaining 38 states and the District of Columbia have neither made changes nor are considering making changes to the standard federal categories for their information collections. For informational purposes, column 1 of table 1 presents the percent minority enrollment of elementary and secondary students in each state and the District of Columbia as of fall 1995 (U.S. Department of Education,1997).

Five of the states that have made changes use a "multiracial" category, and North Carolina uses an "other" category without specification (table 2). Rhode Island uses "other, with specification" for special education students and students with limited English proficiency. Alaska has divided the American Indian or Alaskan Native category into two separate categories, whereas California has removed Filipino from the Asian or Pacific Islander category and made it a separate classification. The three states that were considering modifications to the categories—Arizona, Kansas, and Maryland—are each considering the addition of some form of a "multiracial" or "other" category (not shown in tables).

Six of the eight states using categories other than the standard federal categories modify the data collected to fit into the federal categories prior to reporting the racial/ethnic makeup of their student populations to the federal government (table 3). To do this, three states, Florida, Georgia, and Indiana, use a formula based on the proportion of students in each racial/ethnic category to distribute students into the five standard federal categories; the other three states collapse additional categories back into the standard federal categories. Ohio and North Carolina place all multiracial students into a "non-reported" category.

Table 1.—Percent minority enrollment in public elementary and secondary schools in 1995 and extent to which states have made revisions to the five standard federal categories when classifying data on the race and ethnicity of students, by state: 1997

State	Percent minority enrollment	States where changes have been made	States considering changes	States where no changes have been made or are anticipated
Total	35			
Alabama	38			X
Alaska	36	X		
Arizona	43		X	
Arkansas	26			X
California	60	X		
Colorado	28			X
Connecticut	28			X
Delaware	35			X
District of Columbia	96			X
Florida	43	X		
Georgia	42	X		
Hawaii*	77			
Idaho	12			X
Illinois	36			X
Indiana	14	X		
Iowa	7			X
Kansas	17		X	
Kentucky	11			X
Louisiana	49			X
Maine	3			X
Maryland	43		X	
Massachusetts	21			X
Michigan	24			X
Minnesota	13			X
Mississippi	52			X
Missouri	18			X
Montana	13			X
Nebraska	13			X
Nevada	33			X
New Hampshire	3			X
New Jersey	37			X
New Mexico	61			X
New York	43			X
North Carolina	35	X		
North Dakota	9			X
Ohio	18	X		
Oklahoma	31			X
Oregon	15			X
Pennsylvania	18			X
Rhode Island	21	X		
South Carolina	41			X
South Dakota	16			X
Tennessee	25			X
Texas	54			X
Utah	19			X
Vermont	3			X
Virginia	32			X
Washington	22			X
West Virginia	5			X
Wisconsin	17			X
Wyoming	11			X

*Hawaii did not respond to the survey.

SOURCE: Data on 1995 enrollment calculated from Table 45 in U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics, 1997*, NCES 98-015, Washington, DC, 1997; Data on revisions to race and ethnicity categories from U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System, "State Survey on Racial and Ethnic Classifications," FRSS 59, 1997.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2.— Additional categories used by states to classify data on the race and ethnicity of students, by state: 1997

State	Multiracial, without specification	Other, without specification	Other, with specification	Filipino separated from Asian or Pacific Islander category	American Indian or Alaskan Native separated into two categories
Alaska					X
California				X	
Florida	X				
Georgia	X				
Indiana	X				
North Carolina	X	X			
Ohio	X				
Rhode Island			X*		

*Used only for limited English proficiency (LEP) and special education students.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System, "State Survey on Racial and Ethnic Classifications," FRSS 59, 1997.

Table 3.—Procedures used by states using additional racial and ethnic categories to report data in the five standard federal categories to the federal government, by state: 1997

State	Collapsed back into the standard federal categories*	Formula based on proportion of students in each racial/ ethnic category	Multiracial included in "non-reported" category
Alaska	X		
California	X		
Florida		X	
Georgia		X	
Indiana		X	
North Carolina			X
Ohio			X
Rhode Island	X		

*Alaska combines American Indian and Alaskan Native back into American Indian/Alaskan Native category. California combines Filipino into Asian or Pacific Islander. Rhode Island only uses an "other" category for limited English proficiency (LEP) and special education students; data are then placed in the five standard federal categories.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System, "State Survey on Racial and Ethnic Classifications," FRSS 59, 1997.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

What Prompted States to Make Changes to the Way Data on Race and Ethnicity Are Collected?

In half of the eight states where alternative categories are in use, the changes were prompted by complaints or comments from parents or school districts (table 4). Florida and North Carolina also mentioned an increase in the diversity of the state population as a reason for the change. In Alaska, California, Georgia, and Indiana, revisions in the state code or the data collection requirements within the state government prompted the changes.

Complaints from parents and school districts also prompted the consideration of changes in Arizona, Kansas, and Maryland. Increasing diversity of the state population was also a factor in considering changes in Arizona and Kansas. The respondent from the state education agency in Arizona indicated that there had been an increase in the number of students falling in the "unclassified" category, while the respondent from the state education agency in Kansas mentioned some districts were concerned that some students did not easily fit into the standard federal categories.

Table 4.—Reasons given for modifying the way racial and ethnic data on students are classified, by state: 1997

State	Complaints or comments from parents and/or school districts	Data collection requirements, or changes in the code, within the state government	Change in diversity of state population	Don't know
States where changes have been made				
Alaska		X		
California		X		
Florida	X		X	
Georgia	X	X		
Indiana		X		
North Carolina	X		X	
Ohio	X			
Rhode Island				X
States considering changes				
Arizona	X		X	
Kansas	X		X	
Maryland	X			

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System, "State Survey on Racial and Ethnic Classifications," FRSS 59, 1997.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

How Do States Handle Nonconforming Data Received from School Districts?

All states were asked how they handled racial/ethnic data obtained from school districts that did not conform to the categories used by their states, i.e., the five standard federal categories for the large majority of states or the modified categories used by eight states. Nonconforming data could include missing or unreported data. In 36 states, respondents reported that the data they receive from school districts always conform because their systems of data collection do not permit any variation from these categories (table 5). Twelve states reported that when nonconforming or unreported data are received, the school or school district is contacted and asked to correct the data by putting them either into the five standard federal categories or into a state-approved additional category. Kansas and Oregon submit the nonconforming or unreported data to the federal government as "missing," "unidentified," or "other." Alaska first asks schools to correct the data; if that fails, data are reported as "missing," "unidentified," or "other."

Table 5.—Procedures used by states for submitting data to the federal government when they receive data from school districts that do not conform to the five standard federal categories or the modified state-approved categories, by state: 1997

State	State does not receive nonconforming data	State asks school or district to correct data, i.e., put data into the standard federal categories or state-approved categories	Data are reported as "missing," "unidentified," or "other"
States where no changes have been made			
Alabama	X		
Arizona	X		
Arkansas	X		
Colorado		X	
Connecticut	X		
Delaware	X		
District of Columbia	X		
Hawaii[1]			
Idaho		X	
Illinois	X		
Iowa	X		
Kansas			X
Kentucky	X		
Louisiana	X		
Maine	X		
Maryland	X		
Massachusetts	X		
Michigan	X		
Minnesota	X		
Mississippi	X		
Missouri	X		
Montana	X		
Nebraska		X	
Nevada	X		
New Hampshire	X		
New Jersey	X		
New Mexico		X	
New York	X		
North Dakota	X		
Oklahoma	X		
Oregon			X[4]
Pennsylvania	X		
South Carolina	X		
South Dakota	X		
Tennessee		X	
Texas	X		
Utah		X	
Vermont	X		
Virginia		X	
Washington	X		
West Virginia		X	
Wisconsin	X		
Wyoming		X	
States using modified state-approved categories[3]			
Alaska[4]		X	X
California	X		
Florida	X		
Georgia	X		
Indiana	X		
North Carolina		X	
Ohio		X	
Rhode Island	X		

[1]Hawaii did not respond to the survey.

[2]The students not identified by racial/ethnic categories are included in the total but not in the detail by racial category.

[3]Please see table 3 for description of how states using modified categories reclassify these data to report to the federal government.

[4]Alaska first asks schools to correct data; then reports unreconcilable data as "missing," unidentified," or "other."

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System, "State Survey on Racial and Ethnic Classifications," FRSS 59, 1997.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Complaints or Requests for Revisions of the Racial/Ethnic Categories from Parents and School Districts

Respondents from all state departments of education were asked to estimate the number of complaints or requests for revisions to the five standard federal categories that had been received during the past 5 years. Overall, 40 respondents (80 percent) indicated awareness of one or more complaints. (It should be noted that this question asked only for information from the respondent's experience; the survey did not attempt to get a comprehensive state estimate.) The respondent from California (a state that had made changes) and the respondent from Kansas (a state considering changes) reported receiving the largest number of complaints—150 and 175, respectively. The estimated number of complaints to the other respondent states and the District of Columbia ranged from 100 to 0 (table 6). Respondents from Indiana and Rhode Island reported receiving no complaints or requests for revisions (table 7). Both of these states have already added some form of "multiracial" or "other" category to their state systems of collecting racial and ethnic data.

Table 6.—Number of states estimating the volume of complaints or requests for changes they have received in the past 5 years regarding the categories used to classify data on the race and ethnicity of students: 1997

Estimated number of complaints	Number of states
Number of states receiving complaints	40
More than 100	2
50-100	5
20-49	4
1-19	28
No comments	10
Can't estimate	1

NOTE: The number of states adds to 50 because Hawaii did not respond to the survey.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System, "State Survey on Racial and Ethnic Classifications," FRSS 59, 1997.

Of the 40 states that reported receipt of any complaints or requests for revisions, 24 had heard from both schools and parents (table 7). Another 7 had heard from schools or districts only. California and Georgia added that the districts were responding to pressure from parents. Nine states had received complaints from parents only. Five states also noted that they had heard from advocacy groups representing minorities.

Table 7.—Sources of the complaints or requests for changes received by states in the past 5 years regarding the categories used to classify data on the race and ethnicity of students, by state: 1997

State	Schools	Parents	Other	More requests received from a particular group?		Not applicable, no knowledge of any requests
				Schools	Parents	
States where changes have been made						
Alaska	X					
California	X*	X				
Florida	X	X				
Georgia	X*	X			X	
Indiana						X
North Carolina	X	X			X	
Ohio		X				
Rhode Island						X
States considering changes						
Arizona	X	X	School Board Association			
Kansas	X					
Maryland	X	X			X	
States where no changes have been made or are anticipated						
Alabama		X				
Arkansas	X	X	Minority groups	X		
Colorado	X	X			X	
Connecticut	X	X				
Delaware		X				
District of Columbia		X				
Idaho	X	X	[illegible]			
Illinois		X	State legislature		X	
Iowa	X	X				
Kentucky	X	X		X		
Louisiana	X	X			X	
Maine						X
Massachusetts	X	X	Parent advisory group		X	
Michigan		X				
Minnesota		X				
Mississippi						X
Missouri	X					
Montana	X		American Indian group	X		
Nebraska	X					
Nevada						X
New Hampshire	X	X				
New Jersey	X	X			X	
New Mexico	X	X	Jewish teachers and parents			
New York	X	X			X	
North Dakota	X					
Oklahoma						X
Oregon	X	X				
Pennsylvania	X					
South Carolina		X				
South Dakota						X
Tennessee	X	X		X		
Texas	X	X	State legislature		X	
Utah	X	X	[illegible], Hispanic community, state government			
Vermont						X
Virginia	X	X			X	
Washington	X	X				
West Virginia						X
Wisconsin		X				
Wyoming						X

*States indicated that schools were responding to pressure from parents.

NOTE: Hawaii did not respond to the survey.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System, "State Survey on Racial and Ethnic Classifications," FRSS 59, 1997.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In the 24 states in which more than one group had contacted the state education agency on these issues, 16 respondents reported that they had received more comments from one group than another—11 states had received more comments from parents, and 5 states had received more comments from schools.

Adding a "multiracial" category was the most frequently requested change to the five standard federal categories, with 31 states reporting such requests (table 8). Fifteen states reported requests to eliminate the collection of racial and ethnic data altogether. Otherwise, few states indicated that they had received requests to make other changes to the way racial and ethnic data are currently classified.

Table 8.—Number of states that have received various requests for changes to the categories used to classify data on the race and ethnicity of students in the past 5 years: 1997

Type of requests received	Number of states
Add a "multiracial" category	31
Eliminate collection of data on race and ethnicity	15
Add an "other" category	6
Add an "unknown" category	6
Rename existing categories	
Black to "African American"	4
White to "Caucasian"	2
Redefine existing categories	
Break down Hispanic into "country of origin"	2
Break down Asian into specific ethnic groups	3
Make American Indian a separate category	1
Add specific categories	
East Indian	1
White, North African or Middle Eastern	1
Other comments	
Categories are inadequate	2
Report language spoken at home	1

NOTE: The number of states adds to more than 50 because states reported multiple types of requests. Hawaii did not respond to the survey.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System, "State Survey on Racial and Ethnic Classifications," FRSS 59, 1997.

Impact of Changes to the Standard Federal Categories on Data Collection Procedures

States were asked to estimate the impact of possible changes in the race and ethnicity categories on three aspects of data collection: revisions to forms, revisions to computer systems, and training of employees. In the eight states where changes have already been made, these changes were perceived as having less impact than in states considering revisions or in those with no plans for revisions (table 9). In states that had made revisions, the impact of revising forms was seen as "little or none" or "minimal" for half of the states (4 of 8), whereas 26 percent of the others (11 of 42) had the same perceptions. The difference was somewhat greater for revising computer systems: 63 percent of those that had made revisions considered the impact to be "little or none" or "minimal" (5 states), compared to 26 percent (11 states) of those that were considering revisions or had no plans for revisions. Moreover, over half of the states that had not made revisions (22 of 42) thought the impact on computer systems would be "great," compared with one of the states that had made changes (12 percent). The impact on employee training was considered "little or none" or "minimal" by all eight states that had made changes and by two-thirds (27 of 42) of the other states.

Table 9.—Number of states estimating the degree of impact that changes to the categories used to classify data on students' race and ethnicity have had, or would have, on various data collection procedures: 1997

Degree of impact	Revising forms	Revising computer systems	Training employees
States that have made changes to their own data collection categories			
Little or none	4	3	6
Minimal	0	2	2
Some	1	2	0
Great	2	1	0
Don't know, depends on changes	1	0	0
States considering changes to their own data collection categories			
Little or none	0	0	0
Minimal	0	0	2
Some	1	2	1
Great	2	1	0
Don't know, depends on changes	0	0	0
States where no changes have been made or are anticipated being made to their own data collection categories			
Little or none	4	2	6
Minimal	7	9	19
Some	8	5	6
Great	16	21	6
Don't know, depends on changes	4	2	2

NOTE: Number of states adds to 50 because Hawaii did not respond to the survey.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System, "State Survey on Racial and Ethnic Classifications," FRSS 59, 1997.

Time Required to Implement Changes to Data Collection

States were asked to report the approximate number of months it had taken, or they believed it would take, to implement changes in their system of collecting and classifying information on the race and ethnicity of students. Of the eight states that have made changes already, five states reported that it had taken 6 months or less to implement changes, two reported a year or less, and one state did not know how long it had taken (table 10). In the 42 states that have not made any changes to the five standard federal categories, these estimates tended to be somewhat higher. Although 13 states (31 percent) estimated that the process would take 6 months or less, 16 states (38 percent) estimated that it would take between 1 and 2 years, and 2 states (5 percent) estimated more than 2 years.

Table 10.—Actual and estimated amount of time (in months) required to implement changes to the categories used to classify data on the race and ethnicity of students, by number of states: 1997

Number of months	States where changes have been made	States considering changes	States where no changes have been made or are anticipated
6 or less	5	0	13
7-12	2	0	10
13-18	0	1	7
19-24	0	1	7
More than 24	0	0	2
Don't know	1	1	0

NOTE: Number of states adds to 50 because Hawaii did not respond to the survey.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System, "State Survey on Racial and Ethnic Classifications," FRSS 59, 1997.

Impact on the Ability of States to Maintain and Report Trend Data

Each of the 49 states and the District of Columbia reported that historical files on students' race and ethnicity are maintained. All but three—Arizona, the District of Columbia, and South Carolina—issue reports on these data. Respondents were asked to assess the effect any changes to the state classification system have had and the influence any future changes might have on their recordkeeping processes. A variety of responses were elicited (table 11). About one-third of the states (17) indicated that changes would affect their enrollment projections and/or prevent comparisons across time. However, 10 states (one-fifth) indicated that the impact had been or would be "none or minimal." Thirteen states (about one-fourth) suggested that the impact would depend on the kinds of changes implemented. Although Illinois believed that changes would require starting anew with these procedures, four states (8 percent) reported that changes would improve their data.

Table 11.—Impact of changes to the five standard categories on states' abilities to maintain and report trend data, by state: 1997

State	Changes would have no or minimal impact on trend data	Degree of impact would depend on type of changes made	Would have to start anew	Would throw off enrollment projections and/or prevent comparisons	Improvement	Other
States where changes have been made						
Alaska					X	
California		X				
Florida	X					
Georgia	X					
Indiana				X		
North Carolina					X	
Ohio	X					
Rhode Island	X					
States considering changes						
Arizona						X[1]
Kansas				X		
Maryland		X				
States where no changes have been made or are anticipated						
Alabama		X				
Arkansas				X		
Colorado		X				
Connecticut	X					
Delaware				X		
District of Columbia						X[1]
Idaho				X		
Illinois			X			
Iowa		X				
Kentucky				X		
Louisiana		X				
Maine				X		
Massachusetts		X				
Michigan		X				
Minnesota				X		
Mississippi	X					
Missouri				X		
Montana					X	
Nebraska				X		
Nevada				X		
New Hampshire		X				
New Jersey		X				
New Mexico				X		
New York		X				
North Dakota	X					
Oklahoma				X		
Oregon						X[2]
Pennsylvania				X		
South Carolina						X[1]
South Dakota				X		
Tennessee	X					
Texas		X				
Utah					X	
Vermont	X					
Virginia						X[3]
Washington				X		
West Virginia		X				
Wisconsin				X		
Wyoming	X					

[1]Not applicable. State does not issue reports on historical trends.

[2]"Would be difficult."

[3]"Some impact."

NOTE: Hawaii did not respond to the survey.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System, "State Survey on Racial and Ethnic Classifications," FRSS 59, 1997.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Again, these data look somewhat different when broken down by whether or not any changes to the categories had already been implemented. In the states where changes have been made, only Indiana felt that the changes had disrupted their enrollment projections and/or prevented comparisons across time, whereas 4 of the 8 states felt that the impact had been none or minimal (table 11). In contrast, in the states where changes have not been made, 15 out of 42 (36 percent) felt that changes would disrupt enrollment projections, while 6 states (14 percent) felt the impact would be none or minimal.

Perceived Need to Make Changes to the Current System

About one-third of the states (18) were of the opinion that there was no need to change the current system of classifying race and ethnicity, and that any problems with the five standard federal categories were minor (table 12). Three of these states had already implemented use of a "multiracial" category. In Georgia, the addition had been made in response to requests primarily from parents; in Ohio, the parent of a multiracial child had gone to the state legislature advocating the change; and in Indiana, the change came about as a result of a change in the state code, but the respondent did not know why the code had been changed and personally saw no need for change. Another four of the respondents who shared this view—representatives from Idaho, Mississippi, Nevada, and Wyoming—qualified this opinion by noting that there was little racial or ethnic diversity in their student population.

Respondents from 20 states expressed the belief that new categories were needed either to reflect the increased racial diversity in the nation (7 states) or the growing number of individuals with mixed racial heritage (13 states). Of the seven states that suggested new categories were needed to reflect racial diversity, none had already made changes, and two were considering making changes. Of the 13 states that suggested adding a "multiracial" category, 2 had already made changes.

Alabama and Montana expressed a need for an "unknown" or "other" category. Six states indicated that they considered there to be some need for changes to the system, and another four states considered there to be a great need for change, but were not specific about the changes needed.

Table 12.—Extent to which states reported a perceived need to change their current procedures used to classify data on students' race and ethnicity, by state: 1997

State	Minor problem, no need to change	New categories needed to reflect racial diversity	"Multiracial" needed to reflect mixed-race population	Need "unknown" or "other"	Some need for change	Great need for change
States where changes have been made						
Alaska			X			
California					X	
Florida						X
Georgia	X[1]				X[1]	
Indiana	X					
North Carolina			X			
Ohio	X					
Rhode Island						X
States considering changes						
Arizona	X					
Kansas		X				
Maryland		X				
States where no changes have been made or are anticipated						
Alabama				X		
Arkansas	X					
Colorado			X			
Connecticut					X	
Delaware						
District of Columbia			X			
Idaho	X[2]					
Illinois	X[3]					
Iowa			X			
Kentucky			X			
Louisiana	X					
Maine		X				
Massachusetts		X				
Michigan			X			
Minnesota		X				
Mississippi	X[2]					
Missouri	X					
Montana				X		
Nebraska		X				
Nevada	X[2]					
New Hampshire			X			
New Jersey					X	
New Mexico	X[4]					
New York		X				
North Dakota	X					
Oklahoma	X					
Oregon			X			
Pennsylvania	X					
South Carolina			X			
South Dakota	X					
Tennessee					X	
Texas					X	
Utah						X
Vermont			X			
Virginia						X
Washington			X			
West Virginia	X					
Wisconsin			X			
Wyoming	X[2]					

[1]Not sure.

[2]Not an issue in this state; little diversity.

[3]"Does not want to see a greatly expanded list; will make things worse."

[4]"State is predominately Hispanic."

NOTE: Hawaii did not respond to the survey.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Response Survey System, "State Survey on Racial and Ethnic Classifications," FRSS 59, 1997.

Summary and Conclusions

In response to *Federal Register* notices issued by OMB in June 1994 (59FR29831-35) and August 1995 (60FR44674-93) requesting comments on the standards for the classification of federal data on race and ethnicity, a large number of comments came from parents of children with mixed racial heritage who said that selecting one racial category when registering their children for school did not allow the children to express the racial heritage of both their parents. The results of this survey suggest that state departments of education have also received comments from parents and school districts requesting that alternatives be provided to the five standard federal categories currently in use. A majority of states reported they had received comments that involved requests for the inclusion of a "multiracial" category. A total of eight states have modified the categories used to classify students, and five of these states have added a "multiracial" category.

Respondents varied in their opinions about the impact changes to the five standard federal categories would have on the maintenance and reporting of trend data. While 17 states expressed the concern that changes would affect their enrollment projections and/or prevent comparisons over time, 10 states indicated that the impact had been, or would be, minimal. In general, states that had already implemented changes were less concerned about the effects of changes on these and other procedures than were those states which had not made changes but were asked to consider the impact of possible changes to the federal system. States also varied in their opinions about the need to make changes to the current system. Eighteen states expressed the view that no changes were warranted or necessary. Twenty states indicated that changes were needed to reflect the nation's racial and ethnic diversity and the increasing number of students of mixed-race backgrounds. Two states indicated a need for an "unknown" or "other" category. The remaining 10 states expressed the opinion that there was a need for change but had no specific recommendations (Georgia's respondent was "not sure" whether current procedures needed to change.)

Appendix A

Survey Methodology

Survey Methodology

Respondents

In February 1997, FRSS Coordinators in the 50 states and the District of Columbia were sent letters concerning an upcoming telephone survey on the state collection of racial and ethnic information from public schools, along with a list of issues that would be addressed. These letters were followed up with phone calls to determine the individual in the state department of education who would be most knowledgeable about these issues. Once the designated respondent was contacted, a structured telephone interview, which allowed for different paths of questioning depending on answers to previous questions, was conducted. Interviews were completed with representatives from 49 states and the District of Columbia. Hawaii did not respond in the survey.

Background Information

The survey was performed under contract with Westat, Inc., using the NCES Fast Response Survey System (FRSS). Westat's Project Director was Elizabeth Farris, and the Survey Manager was Nancy Carey. Judi Carpenter, Edith McArthur, and Shelley Burns were the NCES Project Officers. The data were requested by Edith McArthur of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and Sharon Tuchman (retired), of the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) in the Department of Education. The survey was developed by NCES and the OCR in the Department of Education as part of the research associated with the review of the Office of Management and Budget's Statistical Policy Directive No. 15, "Race and Ethnic Standards for Federal Statistics and Administrative Reporting."

This report was reviewed by the following individuals:

<u>Outside NCES</u>

- Suzann Evinger, Office of Management and Budget
- Roderick Harrison, Bureau of the Census

<u>Inside NCES</u>

- Robert Burton, Statistical Standards and Services Group
- Charles Hammer and Lee Hoffman, Survey and Cooperative Systems Group
- Holly Spurlock, Assessment Group

For more information about the Fast Response Survey System or the *State Survey of Racial and Ethnic Classifications*, contact Shelley Burns, Data Development and Longitudinal Studies Group, National Center for Education Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 555 New Jersey Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20208-5651, telephone (202) 219-1463. This and other NCES reports are available on the Internet at www.nces.ed.gov/.

References

Evinger, S. (1995). How Shall We Measure Our Nation's Diversity? *Chance*, 8, 1, Winter, 7-14.

Evinger, S. (1996). How To Record Race. *American Demographics*, May, 36-41.

Evinger, S. (1996). Results of the CPS Research on the Measurement of Race and Ethnicity. *Chance*, 9, 2, Spring, 53-56.

Executive Office of the President. Office of Management and Budget. (1977). Statistical Policy Directive No. 15, Race and Ethnic Standards for Federal Statistics and Administrative Reporting.

Executive Office of the President. Office of Management and Budget. Standards for the Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity. *Federal Register*, June 9, 1994 (59FR 29831-35) and *Federal Register*, August 28, 1995 (60FR 44674-93) and *Federal Register*, October 30, 1997 (62FR5872-89).

Harrison, R., and Bennett, C. (1995). Racial and Ethnic Diversity. Chapter 4 in *State of the Union, America in the 1990s*, Vol. 2: *Social Trends*, edited by R. Farley. 1990 Monograph Series. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Hodgkinson, H. (1995). What Should We Call People? *Phi Delta Kappan*, October, 173-179.

U.S. House. (1994). Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. *Review of Federal Measurements of Race and Ethnicity*. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Census Statistics and Postal Personnel of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, April 14, June 30, July 29, and November 3, 1993. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. (1996). *Findings on Questions on Race and Hispanic Origin Tested in the 1996 National Content Survey*. Population Division Working Paper No. 15. Washington, DC: Department of Commerce.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. (1997). *Results of the 1996 Race and Ethnic Targeted Test*. Population Division Working Paper No. 18. Washington, DC: Department of Commerce.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (1996). *Racial and Ethnic Classifications Used by Public Schools*. Statistical Analysis Report (NCES 96-092). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (1997). *Digest of Education Statistics*. NCES 98-015. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wallman, K., and Hodgdon, J. (1977). Race and Ethnic Standards for Federal Statistics and Administrative Reporting. *Statistical Reporter*, July, 450-454.

Appendix B

Telephone Protocols

PROTOCOL FOR TELEPHONE INTERVIEW
STATE SURVEY ON RACIAL AND ETHNIC CLASSIFICATIONS

SCREENER

1. Do you use **only** the five standard federal categories to classify the race and ethnicity of students in your state?

   Yes, this state uses **only** the five standard federal categories ..... 1 **(GO TO Q2)**

   No, this state has **made revisions** to the federal categories..... 2 **(GO TO Q3)**

2. Is this state **considering revising** the categories used to classify racial and ethnic data?

   Yes, revisions are **scheduled for implementation or are being considered** ..... 1 **(BLUE FORM)**

   No, revisions are **not anticipated** ..... 2 **(GREEN FORM)**

3. In addition to the revisions **already implemented**, are any additional revisions being considered?

   Yes, additional revisions are **scheduled for implementation or are being considered** ..... 1 **(PINK FORM)**

   No, additional revisions are **not anticipated** ..... 2 **(YELLOW FORM)**

GREEN FORM

THIS FORM IS TO BE USED ONLY FOR STATES WHERE THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS APPLY:

ONLY THE 5 STANDARD CATEGORIES ARE USED, and
NO REVISIONS ARE ANTICIPATED.

1. In the past 5 years, approximately how many complaints or requests for revisions to the categories used to classify students' race and ethnicity are you aware of receiving in your state?

   Number of complaints_____

   (IF RESPONDENT ANSWERS "NONE," SKIP TO Q4A)

2A. From whom have these requests or complaints come? For instance, have you heard from:

		Yes	No	
A1.	Schools or school districts?	1	2	
A2.	Parents?	1	2	
A3.	Organizations?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK A3a)**

A3a. Which ones?

A3a1. _____

A3a2. _____

A4.	Anyone else?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK A4a)**

A4a. Who else?

_____

2B. Have you received more complaints from any one particular group? 1 2 **IF YES, ASK B1)**

B1. Which group is that?

_____ _____

3. What kinds of requests or complaints you have received?

For example, have you received requests to modify the five standard federal categories by:

		Yes	No	
A.	Adding a generalized category, such as:			
A1.	"Multiracial" or "multi-ethnic?"	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK A1a)**
A1a.	With space for specification?	1	2	
A2.	"Other" or "undesignated?"	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK A2a)**
A2a.	With space for specification?	1	2	
A3.	"Unknown?"	1	2	
A4.	Some other general category?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK A4a)**
A4a.	What is that category?			

_____

B.	Adding specific racial or ethnic categories, such as Filipino?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK B1)**
B1.	Please tell me which specific categories.			
B1a.	_____			
B1b.	_____			
B1c.	_____			
B1d.	_____			
C.	Renaming any existing categories?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK C1)**
C1.	Please tell me which existing categories, and their suggested names.			
C1a.	_____			
C1b.	_____			

34

		Yes	No	
D.	Redefining any existing categories?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK D1)**

D1. Please tell me which existing categories and their suggested new definitions.

D1a. _____

D1b. _____

E.	Eliminating the collection of these data?.....	1	2	
F.	Any other requests or complaints?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK F1)**

F1. What are they?

F1a. _____

F1b. _____

4A. How does your Department of Education obtain racial and ethnic data from school districts?

On paper forms 1
On diskette 2
By E-mail 3
Other *(specify)* _____ 4

4B. Are you aware of your state's Department of Education receiving from school districts any racial and ethnic data that differ from the five standard federal categories?

Yes ..... 1 **(GO TO 4C)**
No ..... 2 **(SKIP TO Q5)**

4C. Can you tell me any specific categories that you are aware of? For example, are there school districts that use a generalized category, such as "other" or "multiracial," or some specific alternative racial or ethnic categories, such as Filipino?

Yes ..... 1 **(GO TO C1)**
No ..... 2 **(SKIP TO Q5)**

C1. Please tell me the ones you recall.

C1a. _____

C1b. _____

C1c. _____

C1d. _____

5. Does your state *accept* data from schools or school districts that differ from the five standard federal categories, or do you *require* schools or districts to aggregate or otherwise modify their data prior to submitting it to the state department of education?

State accepts variations from schools/districts 1
State requires prior aggregation by schools/districts 2

6. Does your state provide schools and school districts with guidelines or instructions for modifying data that differ from the five standard federal categories?

Yes ..... 1 **(GO TO Q7)**
No ..... 2 **(SKIP TO Q8A)**

7. What kind of guidelines do you provide? That is, do you request school districts to prorate students among the five standard categories by some formula, or by some other kind of aggregating system? Please describe your guidelines.

(IF ANY CATEGORIES WERE IDENTIFIED IN Q4B, PROBE SPECIFICALLY ABOUT EACH.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

8A. What does your state do with data it receives from school districts that do not conform to the five standard federal categories?

The data are aggregated or otherwise modified ..... 1 **(GO TO 8B)**
The data are left as submitted ..... 2 **(SKIP TO Q9)**

8B. Please describe any procedures your state uses to modify these data.
(IF ANY CATEGORIES WERE IDENTIFIED IN Q4B, PROBE SPECIFICALLY ABOUT EACH.)

_____

_____

_____

9. **If** state or federal laws **were** changed concerning how racial and ethic data are classified, what do you think would be the impact of implementing these changes on the following procedures:

A. Revising forms? _____

_____

_____

B. Revising computer systems? _____

_____

_____

c. Training employees? _____

_____

_____

10. In general, approximately how many months do you think it would take to implement any changes?

NUMBER OF MONTHS_____

11. Do you maintain historical files on the racial and ethnic data collected in your state?

Yes ..... 1 **(GO TO Q12)**
No ..... 2 **(SKIP TO Q13)**

12. Do you issue reports on these data?

Yes ..... 1 **(GO TO Q13)**
No ..... 2 **(SKIP TO Q14)**

13. How do you think changes to the current system would affect your state's ability to report trends in the racial/ethnic makeup of students?

_____

_____

_____

14. Given what you know about the demographics of your state's student population, or your awareness of changes or trends in these demographics, such as immigration or migration trends, to what extent do you think there is a need to change the current system of classifying racial and ethnic data?

PINK FORM

THIS FORM IS TO BE USED ONLY FOR STATES WHERE THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS APPLY:
REVISIONS HAVE BEEN MADE, and
ADDITIONAL REVISIONS ARE SCHEDULED FOR IMPLEMENTATION OR ARE BEING CONSIDERED.

1. What modifications to the five standard federal categories have been made and what others are being considered in your state?

For each possible modification that I will describe to you, please indicate if it has been made, is scheduled for implementation, is being considered, or if none of these options apply to your state.

		Already made	Scheduled for implementation	Under consideration	None apply	
A.	Add generalized categories, such as:					
A1.	"Multiracial" or "multi-ethnic?" ...	1	2	3	4	**(IF 1-3, ASK A1a)**
	A1a. With space for specification? YES _____ NO _____					
A2.	"Other" or "undesignated?".....	1	2	3	4	**(IF 1-3, ASK A2a)**
	A2a. With space for specification? YES _____ NO _____					
A3.	"Unknown?"	1	2	3	4	
A4.	Some other general category?.....	1	2	3	4	**(IF 1-3, ASK A4a)**
	A4a. What is the name of this category? _____					
B.	Add specific racial or ethnic categories, such as Filipino? **(RECORD ALL SPECIFIC CATEGORIES NAMED)**					
B1.	_____	1	2	3		
B2.	_____	1	2	3		
B3.	_____	1	2	3		
B4.	_____	1	2	3		
C.	Rename any existing categories? **(RECORD THE CATEGORY AND NEW NAME)**					
C1.	_____	1	2	3		
C2.	_____	1	2	3		

		Already made	Scheduled for implementation	Under consideration
D.	Redefine any existing categories? **(RECORD THE CATEGORY AND THE KIND OF REDEFINITION)**			
	D1. _____	1	2	3
	D2. _____	1	2	3
E.	Are there any other modifications that I didn't name? If so, please describe them to me and indicate if they have been made, are scheduled to be implemented, or are being considered?			
	E1. _____	1	2	3
	E2. _____	1	2	3

2A. Does your state provide schools/school district with specific definitions of the modifications or additions that have already been made?

Yes	1	**(GO TO 2B)**
No	2	**(SKIP TO Q3)**

2B. Can you send us a copy of these definitions?

Yes	1	**(GIVE ADDRESS OR FAX #)**
No	2	

3. Does your state modify racial and ethnic data classified according to the revised categories you are using prior to reporting the data to the federal government (i.e., in order to conform to the federal categories)?

Yes	1	**(GO TO Q4)**
No, data are left as submitted	2	**(SKIP TO Q5)**

4. What procedures does your state follow to modify these data? That is, do you prorate students among the five standard categories by some formula, or by some other kind of aggregating system? Please describe the procedures you use to modify these data.
(PROBE SPECIFICALLY ABOUT ANY REVISED CATEGORIES THAT WERE IDENTIFIED AS "ALREADY MADE" IN Q1.)

_____

_____

_____

5. To what institutions or agencies do the revisions that **have already been made** apply?

		Yes	No	
A.	All school districts?	1	2	
B.	Entire department of education?	1	2	
C.	State agency that deals with K-12 schools?	1	2	
D.	Other state agencies or departments?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK D1)**

D1. What are the other agencies?

D1a. _____

D1b. _____

D1c. _____

6. To what institutions or agencies will the revisions **that are scheduled for implementation** apply?

		Yes	No	
A.	All school districts?	1	2	
B.	Entire department of education?	1	2	
C.	Other state agencies or departments?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK C1)**

C1. What are the other agencies?

C1a. _____

C1b. _____

C1c. _____

7. How have these revisions or additions been authorized -- by state law, state regulation, state guidelines issued to schools? When were they passed, and when were they adopted for use?
If yes,

		Yes	No	Date passed (MO/YR)	Date adopted (MO/YR)	
A.	State law passed	1	2	_____	_____	
B.	State regulation adopted	1	2	_____	_____	
C.	State guidelines issued to schools	1	2	_____	_____	
D.	Some other procedure.	1	2	_____	_____	**(IF YES, ASK D1)**

D1. Please describe the procedure

-

-

8. What has prompted your state to revise or add to the five standard federal categories?

	Yes	No	
A. For instance, was it prompted by requests or complaints from outside the state government, such as parents or school districts?	1	2	
B. Did data collection requirements from within the state government prompt the revisions?	1	2	
C. Are there any other reasons why your state made these revisions?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK C1)**

C1. Please explain any other reasons.

_____

_____

(IF RESPONDENT ANSWERED NO TO Q8A, GO TO Q9; OTHERWISE, SKIP TO Q10A)

9. In the past 5 years, approximately how many complaints or requests for revisions to the categories used to classify students' race and ethnicity are you aware of receiving in your state?

Number of complaints _____

(IF RESPONDENT ANSWERS "NONE," SKIP TO Q12A)

10A. From whom have these requests or complaints come? For instance, have you heard from:

		Yes	No	
A1.	Schools or school districts?	1	2	
A2.	Parents?	1	2	
A3.	Organizations?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK A3a)**

A3a. Which ones?

A3a1. _____

A3a2. _____

A4.	Anyone else?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK A4a)**

A4a. Who else?

_____

10B. Have you received more complaints from any one particular group? 1 2 **(IF YES, ASK B1)**

B1. Which group is this?

_____

11. What kinds of requests or complaints have you received?

For example, have you received requests to modify the current categories by:

		Yes	No	
A.	Adding a generalized category, such as:			
A1.	"Multiracial" or "multi-ethnic?"	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK A1a)**
A1a.	With space for specification?	1	2	
A2.	"Other" or "undesignated?"	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK A2a)**
A2a.	With space for specification?	1	2	
A3.	"Unknown?"	1	2	
A4.	Some other general category?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK A4a)**

A4a. What is that category?

_____

B. Adding specific racial or ethnic categories, such as Filipino? ..... 1 2 **(IF YES, ASK B1)**

B1. Please tell me which specific categories.

B1a. _____

B1b. _____

B1c. _____

B1d. _____

C. Renaming any existing categories? ..... 1 2 **(IF YES, ASK C1)**

C1. Please tell me which existing categories, and the suggested names.

C1a. _____

C1b. _____

		Yes	No	
D.	Redefining any existing categories?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK D1)**

D1. Please tell me which existing categories and their suggested new definitions.

D1a. _____

D1b. _____

E.	Eliminating the collection of these data?.....	1	2	
F.	Any other requests or complaints?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK F1)**

F1. What are they?

F1a. _____

F1b. _____

12A. How does your Department of Education obtain racial and ethnic data from school districts?

On paper forms 1
On diskette 2
By E-mail 3
Other *(specify)* _____ 4

12B. Are you aware of your state's Department of Education receiving from school districts any racial and ethnic data that differ from the categories your state now uses?

Yes ..... 1 **(GO TO 12C)**
No ..... 2 **(SKIP TO Q13)**

12C. Can you tell me any specific categories that you are aware of? For example, are there school districts that use a generalized category, such as "other" or "multiracial," or some specific alternative racial or ethnic categories, such as Filipino?

Yes ..... 1 **(GO TO C1)**
No ..... 2 **(SKIP TO Q13)**

C1. Please tell me the ones you recall.

C1a. _____

C1b. _____

C1c. _____

C1d. _____

13. Does your state *accept* data from schools or school districts that differ from the categories your state uses, or do you *require* schools or districts to aggregate or otherwise modify their data prior to submitting it to the state department of education?

State accepts variations by schools/districts..... 1
State requires prior aggregation by schools/districts..... 2

14. Does your state provide schools and school districts with guidelines or instructions for modifying data that differ from the categories your state uses?

Yes ..... 1 **(GO TO Q15)**
No ..... 2 **(SKIP TO Q16A)**

15. What kind of guidelines do you provide? That is, do you request school districts to prorate students among other categories by some formula, or by some other kind of aggregating system? Please describe your guidelines.
(IF ANY CATEGORIES WERE IDENTIFIED IN Q12B, PROBE SPECIFICALLY ABOUT EACH.)

_____

_____

_____

16A. What does your state do with data it receives from schools or school districts that do not conform to the categories your state uses?

The data are aggregated or otherwise modified ..... 1 **(GO TO 16B)**
The data are left as submitted..... 2 **(SKIP TO Q18)**

16B. Please describe the procedures your state uses to modify these data.

(IF ANY CATEGORIES WERE IDENTIFIED IN Q12B, PROBE SPECIFICALLY ABOUT EACH.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

17. What has been the impact of implementing the modifications that your state has made on the following procedures:

A. Revising forms?_____

_____

_____

B. Revising computer systems?_____

_____

_____

C. Training employees?_____

_____

_____

18. In general, approximately how many months did it take to fully implement these changes?

NUMBER OF MONTHS_____

19. Do you maintain historical files on the racial and ethnic data collected in your state?

Yes ..... 1 **(GO TO Q20)**
No ..... 2 **(SKIP TO Q21)**

20. Do you issue reports on these data?

Yes ..... 1 **(GO TO Q21)**
No ..... 2 **(SKIP TO Q22)**

21. How have the changes you have made affected your state's ability to report trends in the racial/ethnic makeup of students?

_____

_____

22. Given what you know about the demographics of your state's student population, or your awareness of changes or trends in these demographics, such as immigration or migration trends, to what extent do you think there is a need to change the current system of classifying racial and ethnic data?

_____

_____

BLUE FORM

THIS FORM IS TO BE USED ONLY FOR STATES WHERE THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS APPLY:
ONLY THE 5 STANDARD CATEGORIES ARE USED, but
REVISIONS ARE SCHEDULED FOR IMPLEMENTATION OR ARE BEING CONSIDERED.

1. What modifications to the five standard federal categories are scheduled for implementation or are being considered in your state?

For each possible modification that I will describe to you, please indicate if it is scheduled for implementation, is being considered, or if neither of these options apply to your state.

		Scheduled for implementation	Under consideration	None apply	
A.	Adding a generalized category, such as:				
A1.	"Multiracial" or "multi-ethnic?"	1	2	3	**(IF 1 OR 2, ASK A2a)**
	A1a. With space for specification? YES _____ NO _____				
A2.	"Other " or "undesignated?"	1	2	3	**(IF 1 OR 2, ASK A2a)**
	A2a. With space for specification? YES _____ NO _____				
A3.	"Unknown?"	1	2	3	
A4.	Some other general category?.....	1	2	3	**(IF 1 OR 2, ASK A4a)**
	A4a. What is the name of this category? _____				
B.	Adding specific racial or ethnic categories, such as Filipino? **(RECORD ALL SPECIFIC CATEGORIES NAMED)**				
B1.	_____	1	2		
B2.	_____	1	2		
B3.	_____	1	2		
B4.	_____	1	2		

		Scheduled for implementation	Under consideration
C.	Renaming any existing categories? **(RECORD THE CATEGORY AND NEW NAME)**		
	C1. _____	1	2
	C2. _____	1	2
D.	Redefining any existing categories? **(RECORD THE CATEGORY AND THE KIND OF REDEFINITION)**		
	D1. _____	1	2
	D2. _____	1	2

E. Are there any other modifications scheduled for implementation or under consideration? If so, please describe them and indicate if they are scheduled for implementation or are being considered.

E1. _____	1	2
E2. _____	1	2

REFER TO QUESTION 1 WHEN ASKING QUESTIONS 2-4.

2A. **(IF NO ITEMS WERE CIRCLED IN COLUMN 1 OF Q1, SKIP TO Q2B)** What institutions or agencies will be affected by the revisions that are scheduled for implementation?

		Yes	No	
A.	All school districts?	1	2	
B.	Entire department of education?	1	2	
C.	State agency that deals with K-12 schools?	1	2	
D.	Other state agencies or departments?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK D1)**

D1. What are the other agencies?

D1a. _____

D1b. _____

D1c. _____

50

2B. **(IF NO ITEMS WERE CIRCLED IN COLUMN 2 OF Q1, SKIP TO Q3)** What institutions or agencies will be affected by those revisions that are being considered?

		Yes	No	
A.	All school districts?	1	2	
B.	Entire department of education?	1	2	
C.	State agency that deals with K-12 schools?	1	2	
D.	Other state agencies or departments?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK D1)**

D1. What are the other agencies?

D1a. _____

D1b. _____

D1c. _____

(IF NO ITEMS WERE CIRCLED IN COLUMN 1 OF Q1, SKIP TO Q4.)

3. How were the revisions or additions that are scheduled for implementation authorized -- by state law, state regulation, state guidelines issued to schools? When were they passed, and when must they be adopted?
If yes,

		Yes	No	Date passed (MO/YR)	Date adopted (MO/YR)	
A.	State law passed	1	2	_____	_____	
B.	State regulation adopted	1	2	_____	_____	
C.	State guidelines issued to schools	1	2	_____	_____	
D.	Some other procedure.	1	2	_____	_____	**(IF YES, ASK D1)**

D1. Please describe the procedure

_____

_____

4. What has prompted your state to revise or add to the five standard federal categories?

	Yes	No	
A. For instance, was it prompted by requests or complaints from outside the state government, such as parents or school districts?	1	2	
B. Did data collection requirements from within the state government prompt the revisions?	1	2	
C. Are there any other reasons why your state made these revisions?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK C1)**

C1. Please explain any other reasons.

_____

_____

(IF RESPONDENT ANSWERED NO TO Q4A, GO TO Q5; OTHERWISE, SKIP TO Q6A)

5. In the past 5 years, approximately how many complaints or requests for revisions to the categories used to classify students' race and ethnicity are you aware of receiving in your state?

Number of complaints _____

(IF RESPONDENT ANSWERS "NONE," SKIP TO Q8A)

6A. From whom have the requests or complaints about the five standard categories come?

For instance, have you heard from:

		Yes	No	
A1.	Schools or school districts?	1	2	
A2.	Parents?	1	2	
A3.	Organizations?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK A3a)**

A3a. Which ones?

A3a1. _____

A3a2. _____

A4.	Anyone else?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK A4a)**

A4a. Who else?

_____

6B. Have you received more complaints from any one particular group? 1 2 **(IF YES, ASK B1)**

B1. Which group is this?

_____

7. What kinds of requests or complaints have you received?

For example, have you received requests to modify the current categories by:

		Yes	No	
A.	Adding a generalized category, such as:			
A1.	"Multiracial" or "multi-ethnic?"	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK A1a)**
A1a.	With space for specification?	1	2	
A2.	"Other" or "undesignated?"	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK A2a)**
A2a.	With space for specification?	1	2	
A3.	"Unknown?"	1	2	
A4.	Some other general category?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK A4a)**

A4a. What is that category?

_____

B. Adding specific racial or ethnic categories, such as Filipino? ..... 1 2 **(IF YES, ASK B1)**

B1. Please tell me which specific categories.

B1a. _____

B1b. _____

B1c. _____

B1d. _____

C. Renaming any existing categories? ..... 1 2 **(IF YES, ASK C1)**

C1. Please tell me which existing categories and their suggested names.

C1a. _____

C1b. _____

		Yes	No	
D.	Redefining any existing categories?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK D1)**

D1. Please tell me which existing categories and their suggested new definitions.

D1a. _____

D1b. _____

E.	Eliminating the collection of these data?.....	1	2	
F.	Any other requests or complaints?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK F1)**

F1. What are they?

F1a. _____

F1b. _____

8A. How does your Department of Education obtain racial and ethnic data from school districts?

On paper forms..... 1
On diskette..... 2
By E-mail..... 3
Other *(specify)* _____ 4

8B. Are you aware of your state's Department of Education receiving from school districts any racial and ethnic data that differ from the five standard federal categories?

Yes..... 1 **(GO TO 8C)**
No..... 2 **(SKIP TO Q9)**

8C. Can you tell me any specific categories that you are aware of? For example, are there school districts that use a generalized category, such as "other" or "multiracial," or some specific alternative racial or ethnic categories, such as Filipino?

Yes ..... 1 **(GO TO C1)**
No ..... 2 **(SKIP TO Q9)**

C1. Please tell me the ones you recall.

C1a. _____

C1b._____

C1c. _____

C1d. _____

9. Does your state *accept* data from schools or school districts that differ from the five standard federal categories, or do you *require* schools or districts to aggregate or otherwise modify their data prior to submitting it to the state department of education?

State accepts variations by schools/districts..... 1
State requires prior aggregation by schools/districts..... 2

10. Does your state provide schools and school districts with guidelines or instructions for modifying data that differ from the five standard federal categories?

Yes ..... 1 **(GO TO Q11)**
No ..... 2 **(SKIP TO Q12A)**

11. What kind of guidelines do you provide? That is, do you request school districts to prorate students among the five standard categories by some formula, or by some other kind of aggregating system? Please describe your state's guidelines.

(IF ANY CATEGORIES WERE IDENTIFIED IN Q8B, PROBE SPECIFICALLY ABOUT EACH.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

12A. What does your state do with data it receives from schools or school districts that do not conform to the five standard federal categories?

The data are aggregated or otherwise modified ..... 1 **(GO TO 12B)**
The data are left as submitted..... 2 **(SKIP TO Q13)**

12B. Please describe the procedures your state uses to modify these data.

(IF ANY CATEGORIES WERE IDENTIFIED IN Q8B, PROBE SPECIFICALLY ABOUT EACH.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. Please describe the impact that the scheduled revisions may have had, or that you expect will be encountered when the changes are in effect, on the following procedures:

A. Revising forms?_____

_____

_____

B. Revising computer systems?_____

_____

_____

C. Training employees?_____

_____

_____

14. In general, approximately how many months do you think it will take to fully implement the scheduled changes?

NUMBER OF MONTHS_____

15. Do you maintain historical files on the racial and ethnic data collected in your state?

Yes	1	**(GO TO Q16)**
No	2	**(SKIP TO Q17)**

16. Do you issue reports on these data?

Yes	1	**(GO TO Q17)**
No	2	**(SKIP TO Q18)**

17. How do you think changes to the current system would affect your state's ability to report trends in the racial/ethnic makeup of students?

_____

_____

_____

18. Given what you know about the demographics of your state's student population, or your awareness of changes or trends in these demographics, such as immigration or migration trends, to what extent do you think there is a need to change the current system of classifying racial and ethnic data?

YELLOW FORM

THIS FORM IS TO BE USED ONLY FOR STATES WHERE THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS APPLY:
REVISIONS HAVE BEEN MADE, but
NO ADDITIONAL REVISIONS ARE ANTICIPATED.

1. What modifications to the five standard federal categories have been made in your state?

Please indicate from the following list of possible modifications which ones your state has made.

		Yes	No	
A.	Added a generalized category, such as:			
A1.	"Multiracial" or "multi-ethnic?"	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK A1a)**
A1a.	With space for specification?	1	2	
A2.	"Other" or "undesignated?"	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK A2a)**
A2a.	With space for specification?	1	2	
A3.	"Unknown?"	1	2	
A4.	Some other general category?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK A4a)**

A4a. What is that category?

_____

B. Added specific racial or ethnic categories, such as Filipino? 1 2 **(IF YES, ASK B1)**

B1. Please tell me which specific categories.

B1a. _____

B1b. _____

B1c. _____

B1d. _____

C. Renamed any existing categories? 1 2 **(IF YES, ASK C1)**

C1. Please tell me which existing categories were changed and their new names.

C1a. _____

C1b. _____

	Yes	No	
D. Redefined any existing categories?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK D1)**

D1. Please tell me which existing categories, and the new definitions.

D1a. _____

D1b. _____

E. Are there any other modifications you have made that I didn't name?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK E1)**

E1. What are they?

E1a. _____

E1b. _____

2A. Does your state provide schools/school districts with specific definitions of these modifications or additions?

Yes	1	**(GO TO 2B)**
No	2	**(SKIP TO Q3)**

2B. Can you send us a copy of these definitions?

Yes	1	**(GIVE ADDRESS OR FAX #)**
No	2	

3. Does your state modify racial and ethnic data classified according to these revised categories prior to reporting the data to the federal government (i.e., in order to conform to the federal categories)?

Yes	1	**(GO TO Q4)**
No, data are left as submitted	2	**(SKIP TO Q5)**

4. What procedures does your state follow to aggregate these data? That is, do you prorate students among the five standard categories by some formula, or by some other kind of aggregating system? Please describe the procedures you use to modify these data.
(PROBE SPECIFICALLY ABOUT THOSE REVISIONS THAT WERE IDENTIFIED IN Q1.)

_____

_____

_____

5. To what institutions or agencies do the revisions that have been made apply?

		Yes	No	
A.	All school districts?	1	2	
B.	Entire department of education?	1	2	
C.	Other state agencies or departments?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK C1)**

C1. What are the other agencies?

C1a. _____

C1b. _____

C1c. _____

6. How have these revisions or additions been authorized -- by state law, state regulation, state guidelines issued to schools? When were they passed, and when were they adopted for use?
If yes,

		Yes	No	Date passed (MO/YR)	Date adopted (MO/YR)	
A.	State law passed	1	2	_____	_____	
B.	State regulation adopted	1	2	_____	_____	
C.	State guidelines issued to schools	1	2	_____	_____	
D.	Some other procedure	1	2	_____	_____	**(IF YES, ASK D1)**

D1. Please describe the procedure.

_____

_____

7. What prompted your state to revise or add to the five standard federal categories?

	Yes	No	
A. For instance, was it prompted by requests or complaints from outside the state government, such as parents or school districts?	1	2	
B. Did data collection requirements from within the state government prompt the revisions?	1	2	
C. Are there any other reasons why your state made these revisions?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK C1)**

C1. Please explain any other reasons.

_____

_____

(IF RESPONDENT ANSWERED NO TO PART A, GO TO Q8; OTHERWISE, SKIP TO Q9A)

8. In the past 5 years, approximately how many complaints or requests for revisions to the categories used to classify students' race and ethnicity are you aware of receiving in your state?

Number of complaints _____

(IF RESPONDENT ANSWERS "NONE," SKIP TO Q11A)

9A. From whom have these requests or complaints come? For instance, have you heard from:

		Yes	No	
A1.	Schools or school districts?	1	2	
A2.	Parents?	1	2	
A3.	Organizations?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK A3a)**

A3a. Which ones?

A3a1. _____

A3a2. _____

A4.	Anyone else?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK A4a)**

A4a. Who else?

_____

9B. Have you received more complaints from any one particular group? 1 2 **(IF YES, ASK B1)**

B1. Which group is this?

_____

10. What kinds of requests or complaints have you received?

For example, have you received requests to modify the current categories by:

		Yes	No	
A.	Adding a generalized category, such as:			
A1.	"Multiracial" or "multi-ethnic?"	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK A1a)**
A1a.	With space for specification?	1	2	
A2.	"Other" or "undesignated?"	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK A2a)**
A2a.	With space for specification?	1	2	
A3.	"Unknown?"	1	2	
A4.	Some other general category?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK A4a)**

A4a. What is that category?

_____

B. Adding specific racial or ethnic categories, such as Filipino? ..... 1 2 **(IF YES, ASK B1)**

B1. Please tell me which specific categories.

B1a. _____

B1b. _____

B1c. _____

B1d. _____

C. Renaming any existing categories? ..... 1 2 **(IF YES, ASK C1)**

C1. Please tell me which existing categories and their suggested names.

C1a. _____

C1b. _____

64

		Yes	No	
D.	Redefining any existing categories?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK D1)**

D1. Please tell me which existing categories and their suggested new definitions.

D1a. _____

D1b. _____

E.	Eliminating the collection of these data?.....	1	2	
F.	Any other requests or complaints?	1	2	**(IF YES, ASK F1)**

F1. What are they?

F1a. _____

F1b. _____

11A. How does your Department of Education obtain racial and ethnic data from school districts?

On paper forms.....	1
On diskette.....	2
By E-mail.....	3
Other *(specify)* _____	4

11B. Are you aware of your state's Department of Education receiving from school districts any racial and ethnic data that differ from categories your state now uses?

Yes	1	**(GO TO 11C)**
No	2	**(SKIP TO Q12)**

11C. Can you tell me any specific categories that you are aware of? For example, are there school districts that use a generalized category, such as "other" or "multiracial," or some specific alternative racial or ethnic categories, such as Filipino?

Yes	1	**(GO TO C1)**
No	2	**(SKIP TO Q12)**

C1. Please tell me the ones you recall.

C1a. _____

C1b. _____

C1c. _____

C1d. _____

12. Does your state *accept* data from schools or school districts that differ from the categories your state uses, or do you *require* schools or districts to aggregate or otherwise modify their data prior to submitting it to the state department of education?

State accepts variations by schools/districts..... 1
State requires prior aggregation by schools/districts..... 2

13. Does your state provide schools and school districts with guidelines or instructions for modifying data that differ from the categories your state uses?

Yes ..... 1 **(GO TO Q14)**
No ..... 2 **(SKIP TO Q15A)**

14. What kind of guidelines do you provide? That is, do you request school districts to prorate students among other categories by some formula, or by some other kind of aggregating system? Please describe your guidelines. **(IF ANY CATEGORIES WERE IDENTIFIED IN Q11B, PROBE SPECIFICALLY ABOUT EACH.)**

_____

_____

_____

15A. What does your state do with data it receives from schools or school districts that do not conform to the categories your state uses?

The data are aggregated or otherwise modified ..... 1 **(GO TO Q15B)**
The data are left as submitted..... 2 **(SKIP TO Q16)**

15B. Please describe the procedures your state uses to modify these data.

(IF ANY CATEGORIES WERE IDENTIFIED IN Q11B, PROBE SPECIFICALLY ABOUT EACH.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

16. What has been the impact of implementing the modifications that your state has made on the following procedures:

A. Revising forms?_____

_____

_____

B. Revising computer systems?_____

_____

_____

C. Training employees?_____

_____

_____

17. In general, approximately how many months did it take to fully implement these changes?

NUMBER OF MONTHS_____

18. Do you maintain historical files on the racial and ethnic data collected in your state?

Yes ..... 1 **(GO TO Q19)**
No ..... 2 **(SKIP TO Q20)**

19. Do you issue reports on these data?

Yes ..... 1 **(GO TO Q20)**
No ..... 2 **(SKIP TO Q21)**

20. How have the changes you have made affected your state's ability to report trends in the racial/ethnic makeup of students?

_____

_____

21. Given what you know about the demographics of your state's student population, or your awareness of changes or trends in these demographics, such as immigration or migration trends, to what extent do you think there is a need to change the current system of classifying racial and ethnic data?

_____

_____

★ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1998 – 443-967/90720

BEST COPY AVAILABLE